

a shade form of *Stachys Emersoni*. However, plants are found frequently in Humboldt and Mendocino counties which are difficult to assign certainly to either of these species. In Humboldt County subsp. *quercetorum* is transitional to subsp. *typica* and in Mendocino and Sonoma counties forms occur which in turn suggest the silvery dense pubescence of subsp. *lanata*, but have the habit of subsp. *quercetorum*.

Stachys Emersoni is by no means a homogeneous species, and indeed, appears to partake of characteristics both of *S. bullata* and *S. ciliata*. The flowers are characteristically quite dark rose purple. As the author has indicated elsewhere there is reason to believe that *S. Riederi* of Chamisso described from "Kamtschatka" is conspecific with this species. The type of *S. Riederi* has not been located. Recent examination of the Labiatae of the Mociño and Sessé herbarium has further shown that *S. mexicana* of Bentham, a "lost" species, is certainly conspecific with *S. Emersoni*. The specimen of Mociño and Sessé is very similar to that collected by Abrams (no. 11246) at Ilwaco, Washington.

University of California
at Los Angeles, April, 1938.

EREMOCARPUS BENTHAM: PREOCCUPIED?

LOUIS C. WHEELER

The name *Eremocarpus* was proposed by Bentham (Bot. Voy. Sulphur 53, pl. 26, 1844) for a monotypic genus of Euphorbiaceae. The validity of the generic name was questioned by Coville (Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 4: 194. 1893) on the ground that "*Eremocarpus* was first used by Reichenbach, in 1837, as a designation for a genus of Hypericaceae." Piper, apparently accepting Coville's statement on faith (Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 11: 382. 1906), renamed *Eremocarpus* Bentham as *Piscaria*. The alleged *Eremocarpus* of Reichenbach which first appeared in his synopsis of the Hypericaceae (Handbuch Nat. Pflanzensystems 307. 1837) is there credited to Spach. The context makes it evident that Reichenbach merely suffered a *lapsus memoriae* regarding *Eremosporus* Spach (Hist. Nat. Veg. 5: 342. 1836, *nomen nudum*; Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. ser. 2, 5: 355, 1836, Conspectus Monogr. Hypericacearum 349-369). Reichenbach published *Eremocarpus* as follows:

"α) Drosautheae: [*sic*, error for Drosantheae] capsula tricoeca, coccis 1-3-spermis, demum cum placenta deciduis. *Eremocarpus* Spach. Drosanthe Spach."

It is quite evident from the similarity of the names and descriptions and from the mention of Spach's monograph (Handbuch Nat. Pflanzensystems 308) that Reichenbach based his characterization of *Drosantheae* on the diagnosis of " *Sectio I. Dro-*

santhineae" Spach (Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. ser. 2, 5: 354) under which Spach included only *Eremosporus* and *Drosanthe*. Without description and without indication of any intent to rename, Reichenbach in a later publication again mentions "*Eremocarpus* Spach" (Rep. Herb. Nomenclator 210. 1841). Thus it seems clear that Reichenbach was following Spach's work and merely changed *Eremosporus* Spach accidentally. The reasonable course to follow in this case is to consider "*Eremocarpus* Spach" as an unintentional change without any power to preoccupy. The International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature do not provide for such dubious cases. If anyone wishes to claim that this was an intentional renaming and, though illegitimate, capable of preoccupying the name, it is only necessary to enforce strictly the requirement for valid publication in Article 42: "(2) by the citation of a previously and effectively published description of the genus under another name"; this will automatically exclude "*Eremocarpus* Spach." In no case did Reichenbach give any page reference which is certainly an essential part of a citation. Reichenbach's vague mention on a succeeding page (*vide supra*) of Spach's monograph is not a citation.

There is an exactly parallel case which is apropos here. "*Eremocarpus* Bunge" appears in a bare list of genera (Lindley, Veg. Kingdom ed. 2: 778. 1847). The authors of Index Kewensis are probably quite right in interpreting this as *Eremodaucus* Bunge, from which it must have arisen by a *lapsus*.

Conclusion: *Eremocarpus* Bentham is not preoccupied.

Gray Herbarium, Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts,
April 5, 1938.

YNES MEXIA

Ynes Mexia, the daughter of General Enrique A. and Sarah R. (Wilmer) Mexia, was born May 24, 1870, in Georgetown, Washington, D. C. Her father, the son of José Antonio Mexia (a Mexican general under President Santa Anna) was at that time resident in Washington as a representative of the Mexican government. Her mother, Sarah R. Wilmer of Maryland, was of the family of Samuel Eccleston, Fifth Archbishop of Baltimore. A large part of her childhood was spent in Texas where the family owned an eleven league grant upon which the town of Mexia, Limestone County, is now located. Her early education was obtained mainly in private schools in Philadelphia and Ontario, Canada. Later, she attended St. Joseph's College, Emmetsburg, Maryland, and the University of California, Berkeley. She was married in Mexico to Agustin A. de Reygadas but later resumed the use of her maiden name. For considerable periods during the earlier part of her life she lived in Mexico but for the past thirty years has been a resident of San Francisco.